

## 'Pere Richard Simon and English Biblical Criticism, 1680-1700'

Justin A.I. Champion

Department of History,

Royal Holloway College,

University of London.

Corresponding with Limborch in September 1685 about the thorny issues of textual integrity and inspiration raised by Leclerc's rebuttal of Richard Simon's writings, John Locke pinpointed the critical problem: 'if everything in holy writ is to be considered without distinction as equally inspired by God then this surely provides philosophers with a great opportunity for casting doubt on our faith and sincerity. If on the contrary, certain parts are to be considered as purely human writings, then where in the Scripture will there be found the certainty of divine authority, without which the Christian religion will fall to the ground'. Establishing criteria or measures of critical judgement in these matters was a question and task of the 'utmost degree fundamental'.<sup>1</sup> Locke himself entertained doubts and anxieties about the authenticity of different parts of the canonical works long before he had read Leclerc: he hoped he might be relieved of such scruples by careful examination.<sup>2</sup> Criticism and scholarship was then a means for Locke a necessary, important and powerful solvent of textual ambiguity: so powerful that it must be used piously and discreetly. Devout scholars of the Church of England like Bishop Brian Walton, Henry Hammond, Bishop John Fell and John Mill, had all applied their learning to preserving the original scripture in the massive volumes of criticism and textual editions that were published between the late 1650s and the 1670s. From the colossus of the *Polyglot Bible* (6 volumes, 1656-1658) which brought together the work of many leading scholars under the general editorship of Brian Walton, through the multi-volume folios of the *Critici Sacri* (10 volumes, 1660) co-ordinated by Bishop John Pearson, to the only relatively short abridgement of current criticism found in

Matthew Poole's *Synopsis Criticorum* (4 volumes, 1669-76) and its English abridgement that went through many editions after its first in 1683 (folio, 2 volumes), the orthodox were not afraid of criticism, simply very meticulous and cautious. The controversial points of scholarship (the various readings, the debates about interpolations, prophetic inspiration and vowel points) were all firmly locked away in the Latinate language of the elite. Indeed much of Brian Walton's anger at the attacks the Independent divine John Owen made upon the *Polyglot Bible* was because he conducted the debate in the vernacular, opening difficult and dangerous matters to an ignorant and easily confused audience.<sup>3</sup> Criticism was important but it had to be careful, decorous and godly or else it fall into the pits of impiety and atheism. So for example, although the works of Hobbes and Spinoza raised genuine points of criticism and scholarship about the historicity and textuality of Scripture, their work was almost uniformly reviled as corrupt and atheistical: since neither *Leviathan* nor the *Tractatus Theologico-politicus* bore the marks of true criticism, they could be dismissed as ungodly without detailed rebuttal. The work of the French Oratorian priest Pere Richard Simon (1638-1712) posed a set of more profound and complicated discursive problems: it was both learned and potentially corrosive of all scriptural certainties.

Richard Simon, published his most controversial work, the *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* [HCVT] in Paris in 1678. Much to his genuine surprise the work raised fierce opposition from the powerful figure of Bossuet who had only been shown a selection of the text and an index of its contents. Having examined the pre-publication samples Bossuet declared 'that the book was a mass of impieties and a rampart of freethinking'.<sup>4</sup> Consequently virtually the entire print run was destroyed in late July 1678, only a few copies escaping (as we will see below) to England and Holland for later publication. The first complete and unhindered French edition of the work was finally published in Rotterdam by Reinier Leers in 1685 complete with additional material in response to two of his early critics Charles le Veil and Frederic Spanheim Jnr. Although disgraced in France, Simon continued his work on Scripture and importantly published (almost simultaneously in French and English) the first volume of the *Histoire Critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* [HCNT] in 1689 which was

followed up by two further tomes (on the manuscript traditions and New Testament Commentaries and the Church Fathers) between 1690 and 1693.<sup>5</sup> As well as researching materials for his critical works Simon was also preparing for his own edition of the New Testament and editing works on the Greek orthodox church and the history of ecclesiastical revenues. Simon was then a man of staggering erudition.

As author of both the HCVT and HCNT the title of the father of Biblical Criticism is commonly conferred on Simon: it is the suspicion of this author that Simon is perhaps more commonly referred to than actually read. With the exception of a few important works there have been a slim collection of major studies of Simon's life and works. Most of the more recent French studies have been concerned to preserve Simon's reputation as a pious and orthodox Catholic against charges of irreligion.<sup>6</sup> With the exception of a handful of chapters and articles anglophone scholarship has almost entirely ignored any profound engagement with either his life and works, and perhaps more importantly the history of the reception of his ideas in England has been shamefully ignored.<sup>7</sup> Much of the historiography has treated Simon either as simply Catholic apologist or radical antiscripturalist. More recently Simon has been placed in a far more complex variety of contexts: Lebrun and Woodbridge have exposed the depth of his involvement with Protestant circles in Charenton in the mid-1670s, while other scholars have explored his intimacy with Rabbinical circles and the 'Karaites'.<sup>8</sup> One simple route scholars might have taken, and still can, into the complex and multi-confessional world that Simon inhabited (and in some sense constructed) is to explore his printed correspondence.<sup>9</sup> The *Lettres Choiesies* (revised edition, 4 volumes, Amsterdam 1730) reveal a series of connections and exchanges with all varieties of men from arch-heretics like Isaac la Peyrere to obscure Englishmen, and Protestant refugees. A combination of historiographical myopia and perhaps linguistic disability has meant that this resource for exploring Simon's intellectual geography has been neglected. French historians of ideas have perhaps not written about Simon's reception on anglophone shores because of an intuition that it might not add any insight to understanding his work. English historians have long been notorious both for avoiding the history of ideas, or insisting that anything of worth stopped at the cliffs of Dover.

Late seventeenth century intellectual culture was far more cosmopolitan and permeable than its modern replacement.<sup>10</sup>

Exploring the English reception of Simon's works, and indeed the network of personal associations made by him with English figures and residents, will both illuminate and throw into relief Simon's own thought, but also bring us back to how and why Locke and Newton could appropriate his work to their own purposes. On the 19th of March 1682 a worried John Evelyn wrote to John Fell, Bishop of Oxford: he wished to highlight 'to how great danger and fatal consequences the 'Histoire Critique', not long since published in French by Pere Simon, and now lately translated (though but ill translated) into English, exposes not only the Protestant and the whole Reformed Churches abroad, but (what ought to be dearer to us) the Church of England at home, which with them acknowledges the Holy Scriptures alone to be the canon and rule of faith'. Simon's work, continued Evelyn, boldly set out not only to 'unsettle but destroy' the certainty of Scripture.<sup>11</sup> According to Evelyn the work was very successful: 'it hugely prevails already'. The fatal mischief was created because the work was not perceived as a work of 'some daring wit, or young Lord Rochester revived', but because the 'learned' author was regarded as 'a sober and judicious person'. Indeed Evelyn insisted that the work was a 'masterpiece' of criticism: 'the man is well studied in Oriental tongues, and has carried on his project with a spirit and address not ordinary amongst critics'. The resultant work was however pernicious. While it was difficult to know 'whether he really be a papist, Socinian, or merely a Theist, or something of all three', the product of his work was to undermine holy scripture: 'he tells the world he can establish no doctrines or principles upon them'. Evelyn's purpose was to prompt (indeed implore) Fell to encourage the 'pens and Chairs' of Oxford on 'all occasions to assert and defend the common cause'. An English edition of the HCVT had appeared in late 1681: it was not however the first sight of the text in the country. Paradoxically it was to England that two of the few surviving copies of the original 1678 imprint of HCVT came: it was from these copies that the faulty edition of Amsterdam (1680) and the later English versions were made. The story of its importation to British shores highlights some of the ambiguities of contemporary understandings of the

status of Simon's work. In contradistinction to Evelyn, the man responsible for bringing the HCVT to England, Henri Justel (1620-1693), although a pious Protestant who became a refugee in England in late 1681, thought the work was of potential worthy purpose.

The connection with Justel brings Simon's work physically and intellectually close to English circles: Justel was not merely a correspondent with Simon but also John Locke. In March and April 1678 Justel wrote to Henry Compton, Bishop of London who had long established links with Protestant communities on the continent.<sup>12</sup> Justel was sending copies (on Simon's instructions) of the HCVT to both Compton and Clarendon, men whom had made the author's acquaintance in Paris:<sup>13</sup> but he was concerned to prepare the ground for their reception. He was well aware that the book might generate fears and doubts: 'son ouvrage est attendu parce quil est hardi'. Justel hoped that some able English speaking critic might be able to accomodate Simon's work to pious purposes.<sup>14</sup> Justel's ambitions were frustrated: the man he thought might be suitable to explain Simon's work to the English speaking world, Charles Marie De Veil, indeed published a swift and hostile response in French (translated into English in 1682 to counter the translation).<sup>15</sup> Justel had corresponded with Simon since early 1672; he was to continue doing so after he left Paris for England in mid 1681 until 1686.<sup>16</sup> These letters are ample testimony to the potential for critical dialogue between the Simonian position and Protestantism. In the course of their exchanges they discussed matters concerning ceremonies in the Greek Church,<sup>17</sup> rabbinical learning<sup>18</sup> and matters of textual criticism.<sup>19</sup> Simon made enquiries about whether Justel might procure copies of difficult to obtain books from his friends in London and Oxford. Simon described the jewish literature held in the Oratorian library, discussing at some length the Karaite commentary on the Pentateuch he had used. Indeed Simon, commented that he was addicted to reading the rabbinical scholarship in the library: he even tried to ration his time spent. Simon was keen to know what treasures lay in the English archives in comparison with the holdings available to him in France.<sup>20</sup> Simon discussed the fiasco of the censorship of his book in some detail with Justel, disputing the motives and privileges of his oppressors.<sup>21</sup> Simon was also clearly intrigued by the diversity of religious practice in England. Justel had reported that he had

attended Anglican, Puritan and Anabaptist places of worship: Simon commented rather ruefully perhaps pondering his own situation 'les Angloise sont de grand *chercheurs* en matiere de religion'.<sup>22</sup> The main significance of this correspondence is to be found in its continuity. Justel still manifested interest in Simon's work in the 1690s.<sup>23</sup> He kept up his connection with the critic even after the hostile reception both the French and English editions of the HCVT received. Contrary to Evelyn's assertions and anxieties, a man like Justel did not feel either communication with Simon, or a championing of his work, would compromise true religion.

That other Englishmen had a similarly relaxed interest in Simon can be established by exploring the relationship between Henri Justel and John Locke. Again there is another surprising irony embedded in the connection. John Locke on his travels in France between 1675 and 1679 took every opportunity to converse with men of learning. One of the enduring associations he made was with Nicholas Toinard whom he met at Henri Justel's house in June 1677.<sup>24</sup> It was Toinard who had forwarded samples of Simon's work to Bossuet which had resulted in the pulping of the volumes.<sup>25</sup> Locke met with Justel frequently in France: their intimacy was such that Justel not only recommended Locke places and sights to see but also supplied him with a bibliography of important works to examine: unfortunately it does not contain any mention of the HCVT.<sup>26</sup> That Locke knew of Justel's connections with Simon is clear: Toinard had written to Locke reporting 'une petite brouillerie au sujet du P. Simon exoratorian' at Justel's house.<sup>27</sup> Just as he had written to Compton to find a man who might be able to communicate the non-controversial elements of the HCVT, so Justel also asked Locke whether he could suggest anyone who might make such a response to Simon's efforts, which he described positively as 'un recueil de lettres qui sont pleines d'erudition Rabinesque et d'autres choses curieuses'.<sup>28</sup> References to the HCVT litter their exchanges: Locke had presumably asked the Frenchman to get him a copy of the work. On the 15/25 November 1679 Justel wrote to an impatient Locke, 'vous avez a la fin L'Histoire critique de la Bible avec une anticritique qui sera bonne et qui vaudra la Critique: mais il faut attendre encore un peu et avoir patience'.<sup>29</sup> In May 1680 Justel announced to Locke 'le livre du Pere Simon est

imprime en Hollande', before continuing to comment that the responses of Spanheim and others had been 'tres bien faicte et tres exacte'. By June 1681 Locke most likely had a copy of the 1680 HCVT: the subject of his exchanges with Justel still concerned Simon, but had moved on from the HCVT to his edition of Leon of Modena's book on Jewish religious ceremonies.<sup>30</sup> Evidence from Locke's library catalogue shows that he had a full range of Simon's works, owning both the 1680 and 1685 editions of HCVT.<sup>31</sup> Further manuscript sources show that Locke indeed read the HCVT carefully and took notes.<sup>32</sup>

### III

If the Wing catalogue of seventeenth century books is consulted there are two entries for the translation of Simon's HCVT in 1682 one under the imprint of Jacob Tonson the other of Walter Davis. The work was translated into English as *A Critical History of the Old Testament* [CHOT].<sup>33</sup> An advert for the work appeared in the newsletter the *Loyal Protestant and True Domestic Intelligence* on January 14th 1682. The two issues are in the main body of the text identical: the title page, the authorial preface, the table of contents and the three books of the work are identical. Similarly both editions have two supplementary catalogues 'of the Chief Editions of the Bible' and 'of Jewish and other Authours'. The Tonson issue also has two leaves containing three prefatory poems ('To his Friend the Translator of Father Simon', 'To the Ingenious Translator', and 'To the Authors and Translators of the Following Book') and an additional work of translation of some fifty pages *An Answer to Mr Spanheim's Letter*. The Davis imprint was translated by 'A Person of Quality'; the Tonson issue identified this person as 'HD'. The latter also had three other identifying initials attached to the commendatory poems: 'RD' 'NL' and NT.<sup>34</sup> So between late 1681 [Davis issue] and May 1682 [Tonson] there appears to have been a flurry of printing activity relating to the CHOT. The implication of the publication of two similar but distinct editions might have been that demand for the work was intense. Indeed Evelyn's remarks that it had 'hugely prevailed' would support this interpretation. The reality was somewhat different.

In June 1683 the London Bookseller Jacob Tonson took out a suit in Chancery against a young lawyer of the Doctor's Commons Henry Dickinson.<sup>35</sup> The latter was a little known graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge whose only other minor brush with history was to be indicted, along with another London bookseller Robert Moon, for writing a 'scandalous libel' against John Tillotson, the then Dean of Canterbury.<sup>36</sup> Tonson had accused Dickinson of duping him over the printing and sale of the CHOT. It is from within the disputes between Tonson and Dickinson that the dual issue arose. Dickinson had approached the successful bookseller in May 1681 with a proposal to publish his translation of Simon's work: he swore that 'it was a learned discourse & contained nothing but what was agreeable to sound doctrine and good manners'. Tonson, convinced, engaged the printer Miles Fletcher to produce the volume: the cost to be split between Dickinson and the bookseller. Rumours of the book containing 'several things which might bring the publisher into some danger', prompted Tonson to withdraw his support from the title. After a meeting with Dickinson in the Fleece Tavern, Fleetstreet Tonson passed the issue over to Dickinson who arranged for Walter Davis to sell the book. Ultimately sales went slowly: Tonson complained it was slow 'to goe off for ready money'. Dickinson somehow persuaded Tonson to re-accept the title. In return for settlement of some £100 in debts to the printers and paper supplier, Dickinson gave Tonson the supplementary translations and poems, presumably in the hope that this would inspire better sales. Dickinson finally provoked Tonson into taking a suit out against him by demanding a share of the profits of the sales of the second issue, contrary to Tonson's understanding of their arrangement.

The publication of CHOT was a messy affair: Tonson known for his propriety clearly saw it as a commercial enterprise alone. Any suggestion of impiety was anathema to him. Dickinson on the other hand, although he said that the 'principle end he aimed at in the translation ... was the pleasing of his father',<sup>37</sup> was committed to the publication. Given that we can say, with some confidence, that Tonson had little if any involvement in the presentation of the book,



Dickinson must have been responsible for the way the book was marketed. In all of the prefatory material -prose or poetry- little attention was drawn either to the author's Catholicism or to the irreligious implications of the text. Dickinson presented the work as a well 'from whence we may draw convincing Argument for the confuting of all the atheistical opinions of our Age'.<sup>38</sup> Here was true learning that would resolve 'the difficulties of the Scriptures': although it was possible to be scandalized by the text this was to miss the point. The commendatory poems echoed these points:

'Nor let ill-grounded, superstitious fear  
fright any but the fools from reading here  
the sacred oracles may well endure  
th'exaltest search, of their own truth secure  
Though at this press some noisy zealots bawl  
And to their aid a numerous Faction call  
with stretch'd out arms, as if the Ark could fall;  
Yet wiser heads will think so firm it stands  
That, were it shook, 'twould need no mortal hands'.

Simon was lauded as the restorer of truth, rather than as a papist destabilising Protestant certainties which had been the thrust of other critical responses. Simon was refashioned into a relatively safe 'Protestant' text. Nahum Tate made this point explicitly:

As Esdras once did into Order Draw  
And, to the new freed Tribes, revive the Law;  
so you, from chains of Darkness which they wore  
The Captiv'd oracles themselves restore ...  
To vindicate the Sacred Books, A new  
But onely Certain Method, you pursue,  
And shewing Th'are corrupted, prove 'em true.

Beyond these additional pieces Simon's text was left alone to speak for itself: later publications of his work on the New Testament would be accompanied by material that drew attention to his Catholicism and to the danger of his arguments to the Protestant rule of faith.

It is important to pause and reflect here on the context that the CHOT was published into. The early years of the 1680s had been rocked by the politico-religious crisis of the Popish Plot and Exclusion. The nation was on the verge of civil war. By 1682 the republican extremists around Shaftesbury and Sidney were preparing themselves for armed insurrection. Indeed Locke was in the process of drafting his call to arms against popish tyranny. By 1682 Charles II had regained authority in London and was in the process of purging radicals political or religious: the time hardly seem propitious for publishing a dangerous work by an identifiable Roman Catholic. That the publication did not attract massive repression (like it had in France) is testimony to the ambivalence of its content and meaning: as we have seen Justel and Evelyn could come to quite opposed and contrary understandings. Perhaps further testimony can be attested for the ambivalence of attitudes towards Simonian criticism in the still only going debates about how precisely to classify Dryden's response to the CHOT in his *Religio Laici* (1683). Dryden's poem, an elegant and acute precis of CHOT, is balanced between critique and applause for Simon's promotion of critical method and tradition. Dryden appears to use criticism as a means of damning not simply Catholic tradition, but also any priesthood that would impose without authority any thing against 'plain' meaning.<sup>39</sup> Although hostile works like that of Charles Marie de Veil and Dubois de La Cour attempted to fix the anti-Protestant interpretation of the CHOT as the only reading it is clear that contemporaries saw the work as different things: some as Catholic apologetic, others as important revisionist criticism, and still further as a handbook of irreligion and atheism.<sup>40</sup>

If the publishing history and reception of CHOT is complex it has at least been examined in some detail by the literary scholars. The same cannot be said for the second important edition of Simon's work that was published in English and Latin in 1684. The standard account of Simon's work suggests that the text was prepared by Simon and then sent to friends in London for publication: as Auvray continues the text was 'un extrait edulcore des deux premieres partes de l'histoire critique d'ou l'auteur a exclu tout ce qui concerne la critique litteraire aussi que certains hors d'oeuvres trop techniques'.<sup>41</sup> It has long been claimed, and indeed the prefatory apparatus to the 1684 works suggests Simon's authorship: this is untenable. In the

*Term Catalogues* for June 1684 there are two entries. The first registers *Critical Enquiries into the Various editions of the Bible, printed in divers places at several times*, [CE] translated by 'MR' on sale for 5 shillings, printed for Robert Hughes at the Unicorn in Paternoster Row. The second entry in the list of Latin books for Trinity term entered the title *Disquisitiones criticae de variis per diversa loca et tempora Bibliorum editionibus* [DC] printed for Richard Chiswell of St Pauls Churchyard.<sup>42</sup> The Wing catalogue has the same titles registered: there is however a variant printer given for CE where 'by Thomas Bradyll' replaces R. Hughes. As with the CHOT the publishing history will tell an important story. The first named printer of CE, Robert Hughes, was a Roman Catholic printer who was later to publish Archbishop Laud's Conference with Fisher in 1686.<sup>43</sup> His name was replaced upon the title page by Thomas Bradyll a radical Whig printer who had his press in Bartholomew Close, who was responsible for the publication of the neo-Harringtonian works on Popery and Arbitrary power by Andrew Marvell. The Latin work DC was the work Richard Chiswell of another radical Whig printer, an associate of John Darby, who was interrogated by the Privy Council for his involvement in the publication of the semi-republican cleric Samuel Johnson's *Julian Apostate* (1683).<sup>44</sup> Hughes involvement was anomalous. There is evidence that Richard Chiswell was a defendant in a suit brought by Hughes for debt; perhaps he retained the registration of the title for CE in settlement of a debt. Similarly it is possible that Bradyll settled the debt for his radical Whig associate by buying up the issue. What is indisputable is that the two editions as published were produced by a radical semi-republican interest. The significance of this in suggesting an authorship other than Simon will become apparent.

To clear the ground before getting to the intricacies of the editions it is worth giving a swift account of the relationship between CE and DC. This is straightforward and uncomplicated: they are equivalents without variation, addition or interpolation. It is impossible to distinguish which is the prior text: one possibility for the different printer registrations may have been to cover up the common origins of the English and Latin sources. The CE claims on its title page to have been 'written originally in latin by father Simon of the oratory' and translated by N.S. The *Term catalogue* entry identified the translator as 'MR' as did prefatory address of the

'Translator to the Reader'. The discrepancy between 'MR' and 'NS' is too large to be accounted for as a printer's error: although it may be fanciful the dual identification may be intended to prompt the reader to ponder on the 'original' authorship of Simon. Much of the thrust of the CHVT had been to indicate how scribal transmission and especially relevantly the necessarily interpretative process of translation of scriptural originals had meant that 'copies' might be 'authentick' or 'corrupt'. The placing of the term 'originall' in the title page may have been a hint to the canny reader that what was being presented was a 'version' rather than what it claimed to be: of course part of Simon's wider point had been to make the connection between the claim to 'originality' and the authoritative power of copies and translations. An examination of the accompanying textual apparatus may direct us to a clearer view of the authenticity of the CE.

CE is prefaced by a dedication and a note from the 'translator to the reader'. Both these pieces of writing assert that the text derived from an original Latin manuscript: even the French *Histoire* 'which is common in every bodies hand, is only a compendium of the Latin, that has not yet seen the light'.<sup>45</sup> The current revised abridgement<sup>46</sup> was effected in Latin to stop the 'ignorant and the injudicious part of his countrymen' worrying their heads about it. Similarly the text had been purged of the 'few passages that in the former edition were any way obnoxious to the cavils of some'.<sup>47</sup> To cap this ironical presentation the translator presented a heiratic defence of the work. It was directed at two sorts of readers: 'in it the learned man and scholar will find what will content him, and the common man, when he sees how many, and abstruse things must be first known before a man can arrive to a competent judgement of Scripture difficulties, will find great reason for modest and humility, and not over pragmatically to oppose his own private spirit to the wisdom of his directors'.<sup>48</sup> As will be illustrated the CE was almost precisely the opposite of this claim, being not a selection of the more moderate and unexceptionable passages of the HCVT, but a vulgarisation of all the most provocative elements.<sup>49</sup> Evidence for candidates for this abridgement is sparse: the fingers that point do however seem to gesture in one direction. The dedication was written by one Robert Denison (dated Oxford, April 1683) to 'the most worthy and learned J.H.'

'JH' was a man competent in 'the study of Critical Animadversion'. Denison knew 'how successfully for many years you have bent your studies to this sort of learning'. Moreover, 'JH' was intimate both with the writings and person of Simon: as Denison recalled, 'For I remember how highly you valu'd, residing in Paris, the Wit, the learning and judgment of the *Critica Sacra*, though otherwise little known to you at that time, then by his writings'.<sup>50</sup> 'JH' was John Hampden (1653-1696): radical Whig politician, friend of Locke and one-time patron of Isaac Newton.<sup>51</sup> Hampden, son of Richard and grandson of the statesman John imprisoned by Charles I for refusing the Forced Loan, has received little historical attention, although he played a central part in the political radicalism of the 1680s and 1690s. Raised in the Presbyterian culture of his grandfather, Hampden received a classical education that included a period at the Middle Temple (1668) and a spell on his travels in France (1670-72) where he was accompanied by a life long clerical associate Francis Tallents. His first rise to prominence was to be elected MP in the Whig interest for Buckinghamshire in the Exclusion parliamentary elections of 1679, 1680 and (for Wendover in his absence) in 1681.<sup>52</sup> Hampden played an important role liaising between the two radical power brokers the Earl of Shaftesbury and Algernon Sidney.<sup>53</sup> At the height of the crisis of Exclusion, in late October 1680, Hampden left the country for France, whether to seek asylum, for his health, or to raise support for republican armed insurrection is unclear. Certainly he was suspected of plotting.<sup>54</sup> It was on this trip that Hampden made the acquaintance of Richard Simon that was to flourish into a brief and rather one sided semi-collaborative critical enterprise. On his return to England, closely involved in the circles surrounding Sidney, Hampden committed himself to plans for full-blown insurrection. His house in Bloomsbury became the place for the first meeting of the Rye House conspirators in January 1683. His complicity in the plotting is perhaps best illustrated by his close affinity with Algernon Sidney: the last letters that Sidney wrote from the Tower of London, after his imprisonment (June, 1683) for treason were to Hampden.<sup>55</sup> Hampden himself was imprisoned in July, 1683, although released on bail (£30,000) in November he was tried for 'high misdemeanour' at the King's Bench in February, 1684. Convicted and fined £40,000 he was imprisoned in the Tower. Upon the accession of

James II and the abortive Monmouth Rebellion, Hampden was retried, this time for high treason. He was convicted and sentenced to death: begging for his life this was commuted to a £6,000 fine. Still a convinced radical, Hampden rebuffed James II's attempts to recruit him and was one of the first politicians to establish links with William of Orange. After the deposition of James II, Hampden, again representing Wendover, was one of the radical 'True Whigs' outspoken in defence of the principle of religious toleration. In May 1689 he spoke in defence of extending liberty to all Protestants, not simply Trinitarians; in December he argued in favour of exempting Quakers from the necessity of swearing oaths.<sup>56</sup> Hampden's radicalism was out of kilter with the pragmatism of Williamite politics: still suffering from the recurrent depression that had assailed him since his humiliation at the hands of James II he took his life in December 1696.

Hampden was a committed political radical: his religious confession was also unorthodox. He wrote to Tallents in May 1693, 'I have been reported a Papist, an Atheist, a Socinian, a Republican, a madman; and yet I would not go over the threshold to disprove any of these false reports. Truth is the daughter of time, and wisdom will at length be justified of all her children'.<sup>57</sup> Hampden's reputation for religious heterodoxy was well known to contemporaries. Gilbert Burnet had commented that he was a 'a young man of great parts, one of the learnedst gentlemen I ever knew; for he was a critic both in Latin, Greek and Hebrew ... he had once great principles of religion, but he was corrupted by F. Simon's conversation at Paris'.<sup>58</sup> Insight into Hampden's heterodoxy and Simon's role in it is provided by Hampden's own hand: in early 1688 he composed and possibly circulated a renunciation of his religious errors.<sup>59</sup> In this lament he freely confessed his most 'heinous sins': at the foremost of his mind was 'that notwithstanding my Education was very pious and religious, and the knowledge I had of the certainty of the truth of the Christian religion, yet, to obtain the reputation of wit and learning, which is so much esteemed in the world, I was so unhappy as to engage myself in the sentiments and the principles of the author of the Critical History of the Old Testament'. As Hampden continued he 'plainly perceived' that Simon's work 'did tend to overthrow all the belief which Christians have of the truth and authority of the Holy Scriptures, under pretence

of giving great authority to Tradition'. Hampden used his abilities to insinuate such ideas to others, 'and I am afraid, I have contributed thereby to cast some of them into opinions, and perhaps practices, contrary both to the truth, and the commandments of the Christian religion'. Hampden continued to give an account of his further relationship with Simon, with who he 'discoursed freely'. Having learnt of Simon's intentions of examining the New Testament in the same spirit as he had the Old, Hampden ruefully admitted that rather than cut off all communication with the priest, he actually encouraged his projects for a 'critical polyglot Bible' by furnishing him with money. The objective of this critical edition was clear to Hampden: it was a 'design which tended to destroy the certainty of the books of the New Testament as well as the Old'. In a paragraph which was omitted from the printed (1733) version of Hampden's confession he went into more detail about the 'Polyglot' project. Originally the project seemed 'innocent enough in itself and might have been considerably useful in the manner it was agreed upon between father Simon, a friend of mine and myself'. Indeed Simon published a prospectus for this proposal, *Novorum Bibliorum Polyglottorum synopsis* (1684), acknowledging the involvement of 'noblissimoque viro J.H.' in his opening lines. Hampden, however continued to explain, that since Simon had 'soe plainly declared is thought to me in that matter' it became apparent 'how the execution of this designe, would have increased in me those loose principles which I had already received from reading of the critical history'. How devout Hampden's confession was is unclear, what it does establish is that between 1680 and 1682 he had become intimate with Simon, and also that his understanding of Simon's intentions was not that of Catholic apologetic, but a far more radical impiety.

Further evidence for Hampden's connection with Simon can be gleaned from the correspondence between the two (1682-1685).<sup>60</sup> These exchanges concerned matters critical and scholarly. The early letters (1682) concerned secular manuscripts and their various editions: Simon asked Hampden to check on various manuscripts of Longinus in England. Hampden had asked Simon for advice on the best critical edition of Lactantius and the Frenchman had supplied him with an extensive bibliography recommending Thomasius'

edition 'qui est la plus estimee de toutes'. Hampden had also asked Simon to verify certain of his opinion about a scriptural 'manuscrit Cophte' held in the King's Library: as Simon confirmed 'il est tel qu'on vous l'a represente'. Plutarch, catalogues of Chaldaic and Syriac writers, Hebrew dictionaries, the Breviary of Cardinal Quignon, the Spanish biblical critic Maldonat, the Codex Alexandrinus, and the work of Leon of Modena were all covered in this selection of epistles. The tone of the writing is detached and scholarly whether commenting upon the difficulties of translating Coptic script or trying to obtain Modena's work on Jewish ceremonies.<sup>61</sup> Simon's replies indicate some of his critical opinions: writing in 1684 he commented on the status of ancient Greek manuscripts, 'vous devez supposer comme une maxime constante, que la bonté d'un Ms. Grec ne dépend pas toujours de son antiquité, parce qu'il y en a de très anciens qui sont sujets a de grands défauts'.<sup>62</sup> The point to be made here is that just as Hampden was deeply enmeshed in republican conspiracies he was also carrying out an assault upon orthodoxy by another means. By the time of the publication of CE in 1684, Hampden was intimate with Simon, and indeed funding further critical enterprises: although there is no direct evidence it seems unlikely that Hampden was not involved in the publication in some measure. Although he was imprisoned from July to November 1683, and from February 1684 to 1686, it is clear that he still received visitors.<sup>63</sup> The Dedication of Denison to JH was signed April 1683 at least two months before Hampden was arrested: preliminary material was most often the last text printed.

That the CE is a more radical reading of HCOT is undeniable: that it was not written by Simon is sustainable from an examination of the style, language and intention of the text. The text of CE is drawn from books one and two of CHOT: specifically chapters 1-8 are based upon chapters 20-27 of CHOT although the order of material in the latter is much re-arranged in CE. While, as already indicated CE, appears to be an accurate translation of DC, it does not seem to be a clearer edition of either the 1682 English edition, or a new translation of the two earlier French editions (1678, 1680). CE has cut out nearly all of the apparatus of scholarly reference and exposition of variations that made the CHOT such a 'learned' production: none of the catalogues of Jewish sources or Biblical editions appears in the volume. Throughout the



work there is a much more abrasive tone in the language indicated most readily in the noted anti-Jewish statements in the early pages on the Massorets, and the much more profound and persistent anti-Vossian polemic sustained throughout the CE. The latter is emphasised by the addition of a small work of Simon written against Isaac Vossius' views on the Sibylline Oracles and the value of the *Septuagint*.<sup>64</sup> The anti-jewish statements, which probably were part of infrastructure of polemic against Vossius, do not fit well with Simon's positive position towards Judaism of the HCVT and CHOT.<sup>65</sup> There are also other seemingly more minor variations that ultimately change the meaning of the text. Although it may be a reflection of a more sophisticated printing house CE has Hebrew and Greek script whereas CHOT does not. There are no Latin citations in CE where there are many in CHOT. CE has 'Carræans' where CHOT has 'Karaites'.<sup>66</sup> Although it is difficult to quantify while the 1682 issue uses a neutral language of 'Editions' and 'Copies' to talk about the various manifestations of scripture, the 1684 text substitutes the more aggressive vocabulary of 'reading', presumably to emphasize the conventional origins of diversity.

The impression derived from comparing the CHOT with the CE is that the latter is a more aggressive, less subtle, vulgarisation of the former. Far from not wanting to be 'an amplifier of Scripture-Variations' the impact of repeated phrasings of words like 'reading', 'this variety of reading', 'differences of reading', 'readings of the various copies', 'various readings' leaves the reader in no doubt of the textual intention.<sup>67</sup> The Masoretic contribution is dismissed as 'Deleriums of the feverish Jews': the notion that the masoretic apparatus could help restore an original text were dismissed out of hand. Again these passages do not fit well either with Simon's original language, or indeed with the inclusion in CE of passages from CHOT which give a positive account of Karaite Judaism.<sup>68</sup> Where CHOT had been careful, even handed, and measured, CE was blunt and pointed: 'there was an infinite variety of manuscript copies'.<sup>69</sup> Throughout CE while defending the undoubtedly Simonian point 'that the Sacred manuscripts of the Old Testament do not altogether retain that Form, which the most Authentick and original copies represent', the editor mistakenly conflates the notion of authenticity and originality which Simon had carefully distinguished in the CHOT. Rather

inconsistently towards the end of CE passages representing Simon's account of authenticity were correctly copied.<sup>70</sup> Perhaps the last piece of textual evidence that this is book has a different tonal quality from Simon's original can be found in its attitude towards the London polyglot Bible of Brian Walton. Simon had reviewed the quality of Walton's six volumes at length in CHOT, and although he had subjected it to his typically forensic and rigorous interrogation, his final opinion was that it was a generally meritorious performance: indeed he suggested that he might like to make a new edition of Walton's work (with his own amendments included).<sup>71</sup> The final pages of CE made many critical animadversions on Walton's work finishing on the entirely negative note, 'much more might be objected against the English edition which I omit, since nothing can be absolutely compleat, and perfect'.<sup>72</sup>

The CE was a book with a much more radical visage than CHOT: it was aggressive, polemical, and left the reader in no doubt of its purpose in undermining the certainty of Scripture. Although it drew its inspiration from Simon's criticism, and indeed may have represented Hampden's understanding of Simon's real intentions, it does not have the sophistication and subtlety of CHOT. The most significant point that disables Simon from candidature as author is that CE fails to use any material from part three of CHOT. Simon spent the first two books deconstructing the sacred text; in part three he proposed 'rules' for more exact understanding and translation of the text. In other words the first two-thirds of CHOT were destructive, while the final part proposed constructive remedies. The reception of CHOT and the radicalisation contained in CE illustrate how it was possible for contemporaries to 'read' Simon's work as both Catholic apologia and incipient impiety. Neither Locke nor Newton fit easily into either of these categories, although they were aware of the potential of such interpretations both from their own intimacy with Hampden or with the published conservative critiques of Simon's work.

---

<sup>1</sup> Locke *Correspondence* II No 834 p.748-49

<sup>2</sup> Locke *Correspondence* II No 834 p.751

<sup>3</sup> I am currently working on the production, reception and critique of the Walton *Polyglot*.

---

<sup>4</sup> For an excellent account of the censorship of the HCVT see P.J. Lambe 'Biblical Criticism and Censorship in Ancien regime France: the Case of Richard Simon' in *Harvard Theological Review* 78 (1985) pp.149-177, cited at p.156. For an account of Simon's later encounter with the censors see J. Woodbridge 'Censure Royale et censure episcopale: le conflit de 1702' in *Dix-huitieme siecle* 8 (1976) pp.333-55.

<sup>5</sup> The first and second volumes of his study of the New Testament were published in England in 1689 and 1692: the third volume, principally on commentaries on Scripture has never been translated.

<sup>6</sup> The major studies in French are H. Margival *Essai sur Richard Simon et la critique biblique au XVIIe siecle* (Paris, 1900); J. Steinmann *Richard Simon et les origines des exegese biblique* (Paris, 1960); P.Auvray *Richard Simon 1638-1712. Etude bio-bibliographique avec des textes inedits* (Paris, 1974). For more recent work see J. Woodbridge 'Richard Simon le pere de la critique biblique' in Armogathe (ed) *Le Grand Siecle et la Bible* pp. 193-206; important manuscript findings have been published by J. Lebrun, J. Woodbridge (eds) *Additions aux Recherches curieuses sur la diversite des langues et religions d'Edward Brerewood* (Paris, 1983).

<sup>7</sup> On the reception of Simon in Germany see J. Woodbridge 'German responses to the biblical critic Richard Simon from Leibnitz to J.S. Semler' in *Wolfenbüteler Forschungen Historische Kritik und biblischer Kanon in der deutschen Aufklärung* 41 (1989) pp.67-80. The most significant discussions of Simon have occurred in works exploring the work of John Dryden: L. Bredvoldt *The Intellectual milieu of John Dryden* (University of Michigan, 1934) pp. 98-108, and P. Harth *Contexts of Dryden's Thought* (Chicago, 1968). More recently G. Reedy *The Bible and Reason. Anglicans and Scripture in late seventeenth century England* (University of Pennsylvania, 1985) has explored some of the Anglican contexts for the reception of Simon's work.

<sup>8</sup> On the Jewish connection see Y. Kaplan 'Karaites in early eighteenth century Amsterdam' in D. Katz, J. Israel (eds) *Sceptics, Millenarians and Jews* (Leiden, 1990) pp. 196-236: see especially pp. 221-229 on Simon and the Karaites; see also J. Van den Berg, E. van der Wall (eds) *Jewish Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century. Studies and Documents* (Dordrecht, 1988) especially J. Van den Berg 'Proto-Portestants? The image of the Karaites as a mirror of the Catholic-Protestant Controversy in the seventeenth century' pp.33-49;

<sup>9</sup> One suspects from the lack of modern archival research that many more letters survive in manuscript: for one such important finding see J. Lebrun 'Vingt-quatre lettres inedites de Richard Simon (1638-1712) in *Lias* 20 (1993) pp.67-119.

<sup>10</sup> For some sense of the connections in the period see A. Goldgar *Impolite Learning. Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters 1680-1750* (Yale, 1995)

<sup>11</sup> See W. Bray (ed) *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn FRS* 4 volumes (1894) volume III pp.264-267.

<sup>12</sup> The only major study of Compton, *Protestant Bishop*, by E. Carpenter (1957) has no reference to this affair.

<sup>13</sup> For Simon's account see *Lettres Choisies* IV No. 9 February 1679 to R.P.D.B. pp. 52-60 at p.58

<sup>14</sup> For a convenient transcription of Justel's letters from Bodleian Ms Rawlinson C 984 see Appendix B in Bredvoldt *Intellectual Milieu* pp.159-161.

<sup>15</sup> See C.M. de Veil *Lettre de Mr De Veil* (London, 1678). De Veil, a Jew from Metz, converted to Catholicism by Bossuet, had lived in England and held a living in Fulham in 1678. He was later reported to have turned Anabaptist. See Bredvoldt *Intellectual Milieu* p.102. Simon commented on his conversion to Protestantism in *Lettres Choisies* I p.87.

<sup>16</sup> The *Lettres Choisies* has 12 letters from Simon to Justel between 1672-1686.

<sup>17</sup> *Lettres Choisies* II No. 12 pp.81-8 March 1672; IV Nos. 2-3 pp. 10-20 1675.

<sup>18</sup> *Lettres Choisies* II No. 14 p.92 1673; II No. 27 p.187 1685; III No. 16 p.107 1680.

<sup>19</sup> *Lettres Choisies* II No. 26 p.184 1685; II No. 28 p.193 1685.

<sup>20</sup> *Lettres Choisies* I No. 7 pp.85-89 20 March 1682.

<sup>21</sup> *Lettres Choisies* II No. 18 pp.113-19 15 December 1678.

<sup>22</sup> *Lettres Choisies* I No.7 20 March 1682 p.89. In this letter Simon also inquired after the motives for the conversion of De Veil. p.87.

<sup>23</sup> See British Library Add Mss 22,910 folios 426, 428.

<sup>24</sup> For the meeting with Toinard see J. Lough *Locke's Travels in France, 1675-1679* (Cambridge, 1953); also see the biographical entry in *Locke Correspondence* I pp.579-82. For Locke and Toinard see Marshall *John Locke* passim.

<sup>25</sup> See J. Woodbridge 'Richard Simon le pere de la critique biblique' in Armogathe *La Grande Siecle* p.196.

- 
- <sup>26</sup> For the meetings with Justel see Lough *Locke's Travels* pp. 175-6, 197, 198, 255, 273. The recommendations for sightseeing and reading are to be found in Ms Locke C 12 fols 47 and following.
- <sup>27</sup> Locke *Correspondence* II No 469 10 May 1679 p.18. I like to think (on no evidence at all) that the 'brouillerie' was prompted by Justel discovering Toinard had been in some measure responsible for the fate of HCVT. Justel was still in correspondence with Toinard in 1680: see British Library Add Mss 29317 folios 7, 8, 9.
- <sup>28</sup> Locke *Correspondence* II No. 504 Justel to Locke 17/27 September 1679 pp.105-6.
- <sup>29</sup> Locke *Correspondence* II No. 515 p.129.
- <sup>30</sup> See Locke *Correspondence* II letters Nos 64, 651.
- <sup>31</sup> See P.Laslett, J. Harrison *The Library Catalogue of John Locke* (Oxford, 1965) entry for Simon, R Nos. 2673-2682. Of particular importance are entries 2673 HCVT 4° Rotterdam 1685 667 L.85 L —; and 2673<sup>a</sup> HCVT 4° Paris 1680. The latter entry is included as explained in Appendix pp. 14, 16 from MS Locke b.2 'Lists of Books acquired by Locke, bills, letters and other papers about the purchase, storing, and dispatch of books, 1674-1704'.
- <sup>32</sup> See Bodleian Ms Locke f 32. It is clear from Locke's method of citation that in this notebook on the Old Testament Locke transcribed passages and comments from the 1685 edition of HCVT (Library catalogue entry 2673). This of course does not preclude Locke both owning and reading the earlier edition. Indeed given the evidence of the 1680 publication, the English translations in 1682, 1684 plus the English publication of a Latin edition in 1684 it seems unlikely that Locke waited until 1685 to read the HCVT, especially given the evidence of his impatience. For Locke's notes from Simon see below.
- <sup>33</sup> See Wing entries S3796 [Tonson] and S3796A [Davis].
- <sup>34</sup> Dryden scholars have tentatively identified these initials as Richard Duke, Nahum Tate and Nathaniel Lee. Both Duke and Tate published the poems included in CHOT in their own later collected works. Duke also identified HD as Henry Dickinson. See Bredvoldt *Intellectual Milieu* p.106; H.T Swedenberg (ed) *The Works of John Dryden. Poems 1681-1684* (UCLA, 1972) volume II p.340.
- <sup>35</sup> For an account of Tonson that does not make much reference to this case see K.M. Lynch *Jacob Tonson. Kit Kat Publisher* (Knoxville, 1971).
- <sup>36</sup> This account is drawn extensively from C.E. Ward 'Religio Laici and Father Simon's History' in H.T. Swedenberg (ed) *Essential Articles for the Study of John Dryden* (1966) pp. 225-232. Ward uses the Chancery Suit PRO C. 8/284/205 of Tonson against Dickinson. See also CPSD 1683 pp.428,433 on the later instance.
- <sup>37</sup> Ward 'Religio Laici and Father Simon's History' p. 227.
- <sup>38</sup> CHOT 'To the Reader'.
- <sup>39</sup> For a useful summary of the current state of play in Dryden studies see O. Kenshur 'Scriptural Deism and the Politics of Dryden's *Religio Laici*' in *ELH* 54 (1987) pp. 869-92. S. Zwicker in *Politics and Language in Dryden's Poetry. The Arts of Disguise* (Princeton, 1984) has suggested that the Simonian parts of *Religio Laici* were originally intended to accompany the other commendatory verse in CHOT: pp. 133-22. Tonson was Dryden's publisher: the other contributors could be thought of as moving within Dryden's milieu.
- <sup>40</sup> Charles Blount extracted parts of the CHOT for insertion into his *Religio Laici. Written in a letter to John Dryden* (1683) and gave it the subtitle of 'A Dialogue concerning Revelation' pp.18-32, see especially pp.22-25.
- <sup>41</sup> Auvray *Richard Simon* p. 85.
- <sup>42</sup> See E. Arber *Term Catalogues* volume II (1683-1696) pp. 82, 85.
- <sup>43</sup> For all the references to printers unless otherwise indicated see H. Plomer *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England Scotland and Ireland from 1668-1725* (Bibliographical Society, Oxford UP. 1922).
- <sup>44</sup> For an excellent investigation of the world of the radical underground press see J.Hetet 'The Literary Underground of Restoration England' (Unpublished PhD, Cambridge University, 1988) pp.175, 186, 186-89.
- <sup>45</sup> CE dedication A2. It has still not been unearthed, quite possibly because it never existed.
- <sup>46</sup> Again the language is calculated to indicate the process of editing.
- <sup>47</sup> CE 'Translator to the Reader'.
- <sup>48</sup> CE 'Translator to the Reader'.
- <sup>49</sup> The 'Translator' indeed made this inversion of intent even more ironic by suggesting not just that Simon was a reborn Erasmus, but also that he was in almost exact agreement with the pious Brian Walton editor of the London *Polyglot*: see CE 'Translator to the Reader'.

---

<sup>50</sup> CE dedication 'to the most worthy and learned J.H.'

<sup>51</sup> For brief accounts of Hampden's life see DNB, the Biographical Dictionary of British Radicals in the Seventeenth Century, and D.C. Lacey *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England 1661-1689* (Rutgers UP, 1969); R.L. Greaves *Secrets of the Kingdom* (Stanford, 1992) also has a running account of Hampden's subversive activities in the 1680s. For the connection with Newton, see R. Iliffe, 'Dispensing Justice: the Political Life of Isaac Newton, 1687-1691' *Historical Journal* (Forthcoming)

<sup>52</sup> For a brief account of his electoral victory against the Court interest, see J.R. Jones *The First Whigs* (Oxford, 1961) pp.45-47, 99-100. For general accounts of radical politics in the period see R. Ashcraft *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton, 1986); J. Scott *Algernon Sidney and the Restoration Crisis, 1677-1683* (Cambridge, 1991); Marshall *John Locke* especially pp. 205-92.

<sup>53</sup> Ashcraft *Revolutionary Politics* p. 179.

<sup>54</sup> See Scott *Sidney* pp.280-82: the Lord Preston, the English Ambassador in France, had been monitoring Hampden's travels, and commented 'in all places he hath been extremely industrious to vilify and misrepresent our Governors and Government, both in Church and State'.

<sup>55</sup> See Scott *Sidney* pp. 301-15.

<sup>56</sup> See entry in B. Henning (ed) *The Commons 1660-1690* (History of Parliament Trust, 1983). For more detailed account of Hampden's involvements in negotiations surrounding the Toleration Act see H. Horowitz *Revolution Politicks* (Cambridge, 1968) pp. 87-95; idem *Parliaments, Policy and Politics in the reign of William III* (Manchester, 1977); D.C. Lacey *Dissent and Parliamentary Politics in England 1661-1689* (Rutgers UP, 1969) pp.225-39. On the 'true whigs' see M.A. Goldie 'The roots of true whiggism 1688-94' *History of Political Thought* 1 (1980) pp.195-236.

<sup>57</sup> See BL Stowe 747 f 16 which also contains interesting remarks about the success of toleration.

<sup>58</sup> See DNB.

<sup>59</sup> Multiple copies of this paper survive titled 'Lament', 'Remonstrance', 'Religious Errors': see BL Sloane 3299 folios 183-185; Add Mss 6399 A folio 63; Lansdowne Mliv.5. folio 37- An account of the confession was published in *The Hazard of a Death Bed repentance* (1728) p.31 states that Hampden sent he repentance to Mr Alix dated 15 April 1688 who passed it on to Simon Patrick, Bishop of Ely. The manuscript was found in the latter's closet after death. The an incomplete copy of the confession was published in the *Gentlemen's Magazine* (1733) May 5th No. 21 pp.230-32. For ease of reference I will cite the printed edition with supplements from Sloane 3299 folio 184.

<sup>60</sup> See *Lettres Choiesies* I pp. 218-247; II pp.167-183; III p.124; IV p.91.

<sup>61</sup> Simon's edition of Modena's work was translated and published in France in 1674.

<sup>62</sup> *Lettres Choiesies* I No 24 p. 224. 2 November 1682.

<sup>63</sup> See Lacey *Dissent* p. 402 citing Morrice January 9th 1686

<sup>64</sup> On Vossius see D Katz 'Isaac Vossius and the English Biblical Critics 1670-1689' in R.H. Popkin, A. Vanderjagt (eds) *Scepticism and Irreligion in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Leiden, 1993)pp. 142-184

<sup>65</sup> For some examples of the anti-Vossian passages see CE pp. 71-81, pp. 156-168, p.179.

<sup>66</sup> A comparison of CE p.29 with CHOT I p.162 shows considerable variation: the CHOT bears a closer relationship to the HCVT (see I p.139). CE includes marginal references and additions not present in either the French nor the English editions.

<sup>67</sup> CE pp.17-21.

<sup>68</sup> On Carraeans or Karraeans see CE Chapter 12 pp.92-7.

<sup>69</sup> CE p.32.

<sup>70</sup> CE p.35; Chapter 20 p.193 follows CHOT fairly accurately.

<sup>71</sup> CHOT III chapters 20-24 pp.152-182. Simon made the suggestion of a new edition at p.182.

<sup>72</sup> CE p.246.